



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/260,437	03/02/1999	JAY S. WALKER	WD2-98-116	6529

22927 7590 05/29/2002

WALKER DIGITAL
FIVE HIGH RIDGE PARK
STAMFORD, CT 06905

EXAMINER

CARLSON, JEFFREY D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3622

DATE MAILED: 05/29/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/260,437

Applicant(s)

WALKER ET AL.

Examiner

Jeffrey D. Carlson

Art Unit

3622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 March 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 and 70-72 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 and 70-72 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the paper(s) filed 6/11/01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-34 and 70-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnsen (US5250789) in view of Gottlich et al (US6024288) and Folio 2/1/92 (Holiday gift subs up, some due to novel promotions). Johnsen teaches in column 9 lines 25-33, the concept of optically scanning a product at the POS, searching a database for any rebates that match the product, displaying a message offering a rebate and printing a rebate form. Gottlich et al states that it is known to issue a coupon incentive at the checkout for a related item based upon the item currently being purchased. Gottlich et al provides examples of related products that would benefit from such incentive systems. Folio 2/1/92 teaches the idea of selling a product at a retail store, the product including an offer for a magazine subscription. It would have been obvious to have offered and created any type of savings incentive, including a rebate for Folio 2/1/92's subscription purchase when a related "item" is scanned at the point of sale. This would enable subscription incentives to be offered and targeted to purchases of related products as well as provide incentives for consumers to purchase

Art Unit: 3622

subscriptions which are not particularly selling well. It would ^{is inherent} have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have stored the necessary rebate information in the POS accessible database so that a customer could be informed of the corresponding subscription rebate when the related item is scanned. The printed rebate form would inherently include information about the rebate, including rebate identification so that it could be properly processed as is well known. Such printed ^{language} coding reads on the code of applicant's claims. Johnsen teaches printing such "code(s)", which inherently includes outputting a signal representing the code. The combination teaches outputting an offer for a ^{discount} rebate in exchange for establishing a subscription when a related product is purchased. The coding/printing is specific to the particular rebate in the database and is selected from the totality of coding/printing associated with all of the stored rebate offers. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have created an authentication code associated with the particular rebate printout so as to discourage/prevent unauthorized rebate use/abuse; it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have generated such a code randomly or via encryption of known values related to the rebate so that the numbering scheme that validates the rebate cannot be easily guessed or predicted, thus preventing counterfeiting. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention that the printing/coding of the rebate offer would include valid dates, productID, product description as well as contact info such as rebate provider, telephone help line, address, phone number, etc as is known with rebates. The printed rebate form is inherently a machine readable message

(specific to the item), however, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have provided the necessary info such as valid dates, productID, product description, etc as is known with rebates as bar-coded data so as to more efficiently enable processing. It is well known to pay for items at a POS by swiping a credit card and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have done so. Such a credit card transaction inherently includes receiving an accountID. Claim 23 is met at least by the database search for a valid rebate (offer rebate if matching rebate is found). Regarding claim 31, the subscription package ultimately includes an issue of the magazine. Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have bundled the subscription package with the current issue ^(F) of the magazine to encourage impulse purchases for those who pick up and leaf through the current issue. Regarding claim 33 and 34, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have provided text describing the magazine offer and/or numeric dates and/or numeric pricing with the printing/coding on the rebate form printout.

4. Claims 5-9 are alternatively rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnsen in view of Gottlich et al and Folio 2/1/92 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Flaten (US5467269). Flaten teaches in column 2 lines 46-56 the use of codes printed on coupons or rebate forms such as productID, ^{store ID} stored, manufacturerID, retailerID, etc to supply valuable marketing and routing information to the system. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the

invention to have provided these and/or other related codes/printing with the rebate form of Johnsen.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Gottlich et al teaches providing a savings incentive responsive to scanning/purchasing another product.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey D. Carlson whose telephone number is 703-308-3402. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30-6p, (off on alternate Fridays).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric Stamber can be reached on 703-305-8469. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9326 for regular communications and 703-872-9327 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.



Jeffrey D. Carlson
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3622

jdc
May 28, 2002